

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/415,696	10/12/1999	DONALD K. WRIGHT	21276-9044	5181	
				<b>~</b>	
23409	. 03/08/2002				
MICHAEL B	EST & FRIEDRICH, LI	L <b>P</b>	EXAMINER		
100 E WISCO MILWAUKER	NSIN AVENUE E, WI 53202		PASCUA	PASCUA, JES F	
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3727		
•			DATE MAILED: 03/08/2002	!	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1/_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<b>0</b>
Advisory Action	09/415,696	WRIGHT ET AL.	
Advisory Notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jes F. Pascua	3727	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2002 FAILS TO PLATHER FOR FLOOR FAILS TO PLATHER FOR FOR FAILS TO PLATHER FOR FAILS TO PLATHER FOR FAILS TO PLATHER FOR FAILS TO PLATHER FAILS TO PL	o avoid abandonment of ": (1) a timely filed amend peal (with appeal fee); o	this application. A proper reply to a Iment which places the application in	
PERIOD FOR	REPLY (check either a)	or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing dat b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of export of the control of the shorter by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three parend patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date of than SIX MONTHS from the new AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONE date on which the petition under the dension and the corresponding and the statutory period for reply or in the petition and the corresponding and the c	nailing date of the final rejection.  THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension  mount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee  ginally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set to	n fee under forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 c/m²)</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/o	or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application</li><li>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	on in better form for appe	eal by materially reducing or simplifyi	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without can NOTE:	celing a corresponding n	umber of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	jection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if subm	tted in a separate, timely filed amend	lment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		been considered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed	SOLELY to issues which were newly	1
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a)□ will not be er s would be rejected is pro	itered or b)⊠ will be entered and an ovided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed: None		i	
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-10,18 and 19</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 13-17 a			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a) □ approved or b	disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)( PTO-1449) Pap	er No(s)	
10. Other:		Jes S. Casura	/
		Jes F. Pascua Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3727	



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132 fails to provide supporting evidence that the "spot welded" zipper profiles of Exhibits IV and V "did not produce an air tight seal". Furthermore, the declaration addresses "spot welding" and not "spot sealing" and zipper profile "end sealing" as disclosed in the applied prior art.